DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 826 UD 009 331

TITLE	State Annual Evaluation Report, Title I, ESEA, Fiscal Year 1967.
INSTITUTION	Connecticut State Dept. of Education, Hartford. Office of Program Development.
PUB DATE	Dec 67
NOTE	67p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.45
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, *Compensatory Education, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Objectives, Handicapped Children, Inservice Programs, Language Instruction, Nonprofessional Personnel, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Standardized Tests, Student Enrollment, Summer Programs, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS	Connecticut, *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs

ABSTRACT

This four-section report is an evaluation of educational programs in the state of Connecticut. The major achievements listed as made possible are: 30 programs for children of preschool age, 80 additional summer programs for deprived youth, special instructions in basic skills for the latter children, increased special language assistance for children with English language difficulties, improvement of attitudes toward school in deprived children, use of non-professional personnel in supplementing programs, meaningful parent participation, and cooperation between public and non-public school personnel. A description of activities and methods used and major problems completes Section I. Section II deals with attendance, dropouts, standardized test results, and continuing education data. The most outstanding projects of the year, and Title I Amendment Programs are described in Section III. The final section lists a representative sample of Title I Project evaluations, followed by an attachment giving the sample format used in the preparation of this evaluation. (RJ)

Connecticut - General

ED034826

CUE

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

09331 E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

TITLE I, ESEA

FISCAL YEAR 1967

Connecticut State Department of Education

Division of Instructional Services

Office of Program Development

December 1967

UD 009 331

CONTENTS

Page

SECTION ONE: SUMMARY OF TITLE I PROGRAMS IN CONNECTICUT

I MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS . . . . . 1.

II DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES AND METHODS . . . . . 4.

A. SEA Services to LEA's . . . . . 4.

B. Most Pressing Educational Needs . . . . . 5.

C. Most Prevalent Project Objectives . . . . . 7.

D. Title I Activities and Those of Other Federal and State Programs. . 9

E. Staff Development and Utilization . . . . . 10.

F. Involvement of Non-Public School Children . . . . . 11.

G. Title I Programs and Handicapped Children . . . . . 14.

III MAJOR PROBLEMS . . . . . 16.

SECTION TWO: ATTENDANCE, DROPOUTS, STANDARDIZED TEST, AND CONTINUING EDUCATION DATA

I TITLE I SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND MEMBERSHIP RATES . . . . . 19.

II DROPOUT RATE OF CONNECTICUT TITLE I SCHOOLS . . . . . 21.

III STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS . . . . . 23.

IV GRADUATES CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL . . . . . 24.

SECTION THREE: EXEMPLARY TITLE I PROJECTS

I TITLE I PROGRAMS . . . . . 26.

II TITLE I AMENDMENT PROGRAMS . . . . . 33.

SECTION FOUR: REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF CONNECTICUT TITLE I PROJECT EVALUATIONS 34.

ATTACHMENT A: Format for Summary Evaluation Evaluation of Title I Programs for Fiscal Year 1967

S E C T I O N O N E

SUMMARY OF TITLE I PROGRAMS IN CONNECTICUT

I. MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

A. Through the establishment of Title I programs, the following major achievements have been made possible in the State of Connecticut:

1. Thirty programs for children of preschool age have been made possible through Title I. School readiness and health development have been the main emphases of the programs. In addition, program activities have given children help in perceptual motor skills, language skills, and social needs necessary for success in the early primary years of formal schooling.

2. Eighty additional summer programs were implemented for deprived youth through Title I. Summer programs provided basic skill help, creative arts, physical development activities, and cultural trips in the school setting, in the communities, and in camp situations.

3. Deprived children have received a considerable amount of special instruction in basic skill areas as a result of Title I programs. Reading, other language arts, and computational skills have been the most prevalent areas of this special instruction. Title I staff have provided concentrated help to children in small groups or on a one-to-one basis.

4. Deprived children have had additional opportunities to benefit from Title I sponsored programs which have had as a major purpose the improvement of attitudes toward school, greater interest in school, or increased confidence in one's ability to achieve in school. Some of these efforts have taken the form of increased services by educational specialists or adult models. Other interventions have extended curricula opportunities to include community resources of educational value.

5. Title I efforts have increased the opportunities of special language help for children who are not skillful in speaking or comprehending the English language. Services have ranged from individualized instruction during the school day to reception centers established to provide an educational contact for newly arrived families to the community.

6. Title I efforts have made it possible to provide heterogenous learning environments for deprived children coming from different backgrounds and manifesting different levels of aspirations and values. The largest Connecticut cities have made opportunities available for some deprived children to attend schools in other neighborhoods of the city and in other neighborhoods of nearby suburban communities.

B. School districts have benefited from Title I programs in the following ways:

1. Title I programs have encouraged an increased use of non-professional persons to supplement the instructional program provided by teachers and other professional staff. By properly using non-professional staff, the teacher has an instructional resource to relate to the "hidden" community of the poor, and at the same time has available concrete means of providing adult figures to work under her direction on the special needs of deprived children.

2. Title I programs have stimulated meaningful participation of parents with the school and their child. With parents actively working in the programs, deprived children have benefited more fully because of the added support parent involvement has brought about for the town's educational efforts.

3. Title I has stimulated increased cooperation between public and non-public school personnel in a joint effort to improve the educational success of deprived youth. The Title I legislative requirement to enhance educational benefits for the disadvantaged regardless of their place of formal schooling has resulted in increased communication between public and non-public school personnel.

4. Title I financial assistance has provided school personnel their first massive opportunity to expand, in directions prompted by analyses of deprived youths' most pressing school needs, curricula offerings beyond that already provided by the town. Where Title I efforts have resulted in substantial gains for deprived children, towns have given some consideration to the provision of these services for other children in those schools.

5. Title I requirements have been instrumental in increasing the skills of local school personnel in the evaluation of educational programs. Evaluation of Title I efforts have helped an increased number of school personnel consider evaluation of outcomes as an integral part of the educational program. Heretofore, most school personnel have exercised evaluatory skills primarily to assess the individual skill achievements of children. Title I program evaluations have encouraged school personnel to take an additional step of assessing outcomes of educational programs in terms of group data.

6. Title I financial assistance has increased local town opportunities of carrying out more meaningful programs for deprived children. Along with companion State legislation, AN ACT CONCERNING STATE AID FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN, financial support for program expansion has been increased especially in the small towns where dollar entitlements, under the provisions of Title I, have been small.

II. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

A. SEA Services to LEA's

Services provided to local school districts by the Connecticut State Department of Education in areas of Title I project development, implementation, evaluation and information dissemination were as follows:

1. A Connecticut State Department of Education publication entitled Hope was distributed to guide local school district personnel in Title I application procedures, program information, and fiscal accounting. A copy of this publication has been forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education with this report.

2. Title I application proposals from local school districts were acted upon by a Review Committee as soon as congressional action made program approval possible through notification of appropriations.

3. Ten regional workshops were conducted by the Title I staff of the Connecticut State Department of Education to assist school officials revise their Title I programs and make application for the second year of operations.

4. Twenty-five consultants of the Connecticut State Department of Education were used to advise school district personnel in the development and implementation of Title I programs. Consultants made site visits to the local school districts to view the operation of programs.

5. Seven monthly meetings were held for Title I program evaluators from the ten largest Connecticut towns to discuss evaluation design problems in their programs.

6. As soon as Title I reallocation funds became available, an information bulletin of suggested possibilities for spring and summer programs was disseminated to local school districts. A copy of this bulletin has been forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education with this report.

7. A publication by the Connecticut State Department of Education, Evaluating Educational Projects, was sent to school districts in May to guide school personnel in their evaluation of Title I programs. A Title I evaluation format had been distributed to school districts during the month of February. A copy of the publication has been forwarded to the U.S. Office with this report. The Title I evaluation format will be found as Attachment A of this report.

8. A description of the breadth of Title I programs conducted during the summer of 1967 was published in Connecticut Education to disseminate information to school districts about the program ideas. A copy of this publication has been forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education with this report.

B. Most Pressing Educational Needs

The most pressing educational needs of youth served by Title I programs was determined by examining a representative sample of program proposals submitted by local school districts. A total of 56 proposals were reviewed: 16 proposals from the largest towns, 35 proposals from medium sized towns, and 5 proposals from small towns. The sample was determined by selecting every sixth project from a listing of all projects from all towns

alphabetized and classified by SMSA characteristics (Bureau of Census Town Size Classification).

In rank order, the five most pressing educational needs of disadvantaged children in Connecticut were:

1. Poor achievement in basic skill areas or achieving below potential in school work. This need was primarily identified through the interpretation of standardized test results.

2. Reading deficiency, below grade level in reading or difficulty encountered in reading. This need was primarily identified by examing school records indicating test results and teacher comments.

3. Disinterest in school as indicated by dropout withdrawals, truancy, and excessive absences. This need was primarily identified by the examination of school records.

4. Limited aspiration goals related to education and vocations as well as low motivation to achieve in school. This need was primarily identified by the judgment of school personnel.

5. Lacking comprehension and language skills or deficiencies in language arts area. This need was primarily identified by the school performance of youth.

The needs of youth most often stated as the basis for programs in the largest towns was "achieving below potential" (20%) with "disinterest as shown by absences and withdrawals" second in order of importance (15%).

The needs of youth most often stated as the basis for programs in medium sized towns was "reading deficiencies" (25%) with "basic skill deficiencies" second in order of importance (20%).

C. Most Prevalent Project Objectives

The most prevalent project objectives were determined by ranking all objectives of Title I programs as they were reported in summary annual evaluation reports received from local school districts. The most prevalent objectives in rank order were:

1. Improve reading ability
2. Improve school achievement or basic skills
3. Improve attitude toward school learning
4. Improve communication skills (These include oral and written skills as well as language arts skills)
5. Develop pride in self, confidence, or self image

Effective approaches used to reach the above objectives were as follows:

1. Improve Reading - Individual and small group instruction by reading specialists have been effective where: clinic facilities were available; reading help for individual children was based on vision, hearing, and reading testing to determine specific deficiencies; magnetic tape recordings of word attack skills were used to fit instruction to each child; and a quantity of high interest, low vocabulary content books were available for children to use in the clinic or take home.

2. Improve School Achievement - An effective approach to improve school achievement has resulted in instances where a team of subject area teachers and other professionals have planned more intensive help in basic skill areas, increased counseling services, kept class sizes small, and provided cultural enrichment to a designated group of youth. The joint planning of the staff, the focus on learning problems of a defined group of youth, and the supportive services of needed specialists have been effective in improving the school achievement of youth.

3. Improve Attitude Toward School - Saturday morning or school-day, camp-setting programs have been effective in improving the attitude of youth toward school. Naturalists and other specialists together with students, teachers, and aides have devised camp-setting activities which relate classroom learning to the outdoor environment. Mathematical applications, scientific applications, meal planning, food preparation, physical development, problems of shelter, and aspects of living and learning together are some of the areas which have been used successfully. However, the teachers and instructional activities must be carefully considered along with the excellent recreational opportunities that abound in the camp-setting, if any children are to perceive these experiences as related to or extension of the school curriculum.

4. Improve Communication Skill - Elementary teachers with the help of instructional aides have been effective in improving the communication skills of children where: (a) a small class concentrated on helping pupils to observe and listen, remember and report, improve in reading, and write and speak clearly; (b) field trips were taken which provided children with additional things to talk and write about as well as heighten enthusiasm for learning; (c) audio-visual aids helped provide the means by which children could work on skill improvement, and (d) classroom visits by community resource people enriched the children's school day.

5. Improvement in Self-Image - Summer programs combined with school year follow-up on the campuses of colleges, universities, and private schools have proved effective in improving the self-image of youth. This is especially true where basic subject help has been provided along with an emphasis on the creative activities of students. Opportunities such as lessons on musical instruments; the writing and production of drama which the students themselves cast, direct, and perform; the organization, writing, and publication of student newspapers and literary magazines; and art work of the students displayed in the institutional settingindicate student decision-making elements for this type of program. In addition, evening

activities including dances, trips, and panel discussions planned by student committees have been found successful in improving the self image of deprived youth.

D. Title I Activities and Those of Other Federal and State Programs

A description of the interrelationship of Title I activities with other Federal and State programs is as follows:

1. Title I and the Connecticut State Act for Disadvantaged Children (PA 35). Title I projects are most closely related to programs supported by State legislation, AN ACT CONCERNING STATE AID FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN. Title I and the State Act have been administered and implemented as companion legislation. Of a total of 347 programs for disadvantaged children in Connecticut carried out in Fiscal Year 1967, 235 programs were supported by Title I, and 183 programs were supported by the State Act. A total of 71 of the above number of programs were jointly supported by these two pieces of legislation. This interrelationship has been especially beneficial to small school districts in making possible more meaningful programs through combined financial entitlements.

2. Title I and Title III. Interrelationship of Title I and Title III activities has come about in some instances. The two Titles were used jointly in a rural section of the State to improve the school achievement of deprived youth through diagnosis, remediation, and consultation. In another situation, joint support through these two titles of PL 89-10 have been used to develop a cooperative structure between an inner-city and five suburban communities to solve educational problems related to the isolation of minority group children in essentially segregated schools.

3. Title I and U.S. Department of Agriculture Programs. The Child Nutrition Act provided funds which made possible a breakfast program in one inner-city school of an urban school district. Related Title I activities were aimed at improving the nutritional habits of the children in this school.

4. Title I and Community Action agencies. Programs for preschool children have been provided by combining funds from Community Action agencies under the auspices of the Office of Economic Opportunity and from the entitlements of local school district under the provisions of PL 89-10. In addition, educational supplements for Neighborhood Youth Corps programs and Work Training programs have been funded and jointly conducted. In some instances, adult basic education efforts supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity provided help to parents of children receiving Title I program services.

5. Summary. Interrelationships between Title I and other federally-supported programs have been encouraged when this type of arrangement has shown promise in strengthening the effort of local school districts in providing additional opportunities for deprived children or their families.

E. Staff Development and Utilization

The following activities were carried out to increase the effectiveness of the Title I staff of the Connecticut State Department of Education and the local school districts:

1. Conferences were held to keep State Department liaison consultants fully informed about Title I progress and needs of local school districts as well as to coordinate the actions of the Department in administering the programs.

2. Local school districts conducted staff meetings and workshops for the purpose of developing new staff, creating curriculum materials needed for programs, to plan and coordinate efforts of the total school staff, and exchange points of view with outside consultants.

An effective summer training program was initiated by one of Connecticut's largest towns to train indigenous people as instructional aides for town Title I programs. An initial period of orientation and instruction was followed by the aide's assignment to one of the summer Title I instructional programs where they had opportunities to observe and work with children under the supervision of certified teachers. Of a total of 25 women who began the course, 24 successfully completed the program, and 22 accepted staff assignments in the school system for the next school year.

In another town, a child study program was carried out where each Title I teacher observed, recorded, and analyzed one child in her class for one year. Teachers were administered the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory at the beginning and end of this experience and were judged to have increased in awareness of the many forces which cause a child to function the way he does.

Local school districts have not been given approval for Title I applications which emphasize teacher training activities without some relationship to specific programs. The State Department of Education has encouraged school districts to include staff training as an integral part of the planning and implementation of their programs.

F. Involvement of Non-Public School Children

The increased cooperative efforts of public and non-public school personnel in providing programs for deprived youth has been cited as one of the major achievements of Title I in

Connecticut during the past school year. An analysis of Title I project application and evaluation reports for Fiscal Year 1967 have indicated that services have been provided for deprived youth in non-public schools except in towns where it was reported that deprived children or youth did not attend non-public schools or no non-public school served the children of the community.

Ranked in order of prevalence, the most common types of activities and services provided for deprived children or youth in non-public schools were:

1. Summer programs emphasizing basic skill help
2. School year reading help
3. School year and summer programs emphasizing creative arts
4. Supportive team services such as social worker and psychological examiner services related to instructional programs.

Examples of effective activities and services in which deprived youth from non-public schools participated are as follows:

Ansonia: 24 non-public youth took part in a summer program emphasizing reading, science, creative arts, and physical education.

Branford: 21 non-public youth were helped in reading in 45 minute periods held twice weekly for the period of a school year.

Bridgeport: 59 non-public youth attended a program of six hours in a creative arts camp conducted at an ocean beach. Also, 41 children attended a school year Saturday morning program of trips and creative arts.

Griswold: 30 non-public youth attended a 6 week summer program which combined physical examinations, sight and hearing tests, reading help, and field trips into a related program.

Hartford: 79 children from non-public schools received the services of a reception center established to help families experiencing difficulty in speaking the English language. A total of 427 non-public youth were helped with language arts and arithmetic in 9 learning centers operating during the school year. A total of 52 primary grade children received reading help during summer months.

Manchester: 36 non-public children participated in a school year program providing the services of a social worker, nurse, and speech therapist, related to a program of reading, arithmetic, and work-study skill help.

Meriden: 73 non-public children in Grades Kindergarten through Grade 5 participated in a summer school program. Program activities included reading readiness, trips, academic subject help, and creative arts.

Middletown: 58 non-public youth benefited from psychological and social work services; loan of equipment and materials for disadvantaged projects; evening study program for middle school youth; and classes and counseling in English as a second language.

Norwalk: 20 non-public youth attended a five week program of art, music, and reading services.

Norwich: 60 non-public children were served by a school year reading help program. In addition, a special art program designed for deprived children was conducted in non-public schools. A physical education instructor provided a special physical development program to non-public youth in the public school gymnasiums. Also 134 non-public elementary youth took part in a summer arts and arithmetic program, science enrichment, arts and crafts, music, physical education, and field trips.

Portland: 15 youth attended an evening tutorial program which was judged to have made substantial contributions in improving the basic skills of deprived youth.

Stonington: 12 non-public youth received help four hours weekly from a reading and mathematics clinic for the period of a school year.

Stratford: 15 non-public high school youth were counseled and helped with job placements during the summer months.

Windham: A science lecture program followed by a 3-day trip to a conservation center was attended by 19 non-public youth.

Windsor: 12 children received one-half hour periods of reading help daily over the period of the school year.

G. Title I Programs and Handicapped Children

The Connecticut guidelines, Hope has directed local school district personnel to determine Title I programs in the following sequential order: (1) Identify children from their communities coming from low income families, (2) Determine the most pressing

educational needs of the children so identified, and (3) Decide Title I program objectives, activities, and services based upon the identified needs.

By requiring this procedure, the Connecticut State Department of Education felt that the most meaningful educational impact could be made for children from deprived circumstances. A breakdown in this procedure to permit programs for one special group immediately brings response from other special interest groups which destroys the needs analysis concept. Further, the State of Connecticut has its own program for funding special programs for handicapped children. For this reason, the State Department of Education has discouraged requests by local school districts to provide programs for handicapped children under the provisions of Title I unless the children can also be considered as coming from a deprived environment.

Handicapped children are served in some Title I projects but the criterion for inclusion is based on deprivation and not handicaps. Of course, the criteria of deprivation is not required for programs funded under PL 89-313.

III. MAJOR PROBLEMS

Major problems arising during Fiscal Year 1967 concerning Title I programs were as follows:

1. Late Congressional action in appropriating Title I ESEA funds and the year-to-year basis for authorization of appropriations continue to be the major problems for school personnel in attempting to make plans and carry on programs from one year to the next. This undependable arrangement in administering the legislation on the national level also hampers the use of these funds for sizable, long-range projects aimed at increasing the educational opportunities of children in the largest towns. Even the continuing resolution established by Congress to continue funding of federally supported endeavors until the legislation is acted upon for a given year becomes operative so late that school systems have little time before the opening of the regular school year to make orderly preparations and gain approval for programs. In addition, the continuing resolution makes available only a portion of the funds. Local school personnel have not yet had the opportunity to begin a school year with both authorization and appropriations for the legislation fully determined.

2. Office of Education reporting requirements for local communities weaken the needs analysis concept, breakdown the categorical nature of the legislation, and require the repetitious reporting of information.

   Federal application and statistical report forms required in Title I application and end of the year accounting require the reportee not only to describe program activities in terms of subject areas, but also require prorating the dollar amount expended for the program among the various subject areas. If the emphasis is to provide Title I funds to increase subject area

offerings for disadvantaged children, there is no conflict. But if there is concern that school personnel identify children with learning problems related to deprivation and then make an analysis to determine the most serious educational needs of these children, the next step should not lead them back to subject areas. The "needs analysis" should dictate the direction of the program. In attempting to simplify data so that it can be more easily machine-processed, the forms weaken the needs analysis concept and the categorical aspects of the legislation.

In addition, the duplicative effort in reporting some data within the same fiscal year is both frustrating and exhaustive of the time of personnel in local communities who plan and operate Title I programs. Many times the most important dissimination of program information (within the community) is not accomplished because of the extent of time already spent in reporting requirements demanded from outside the town. This serious problem does little to strengthen local-state-federal relations.

3. There is conflict of interest as to the purpose of Title I evaluation. The Office of Education has pressed for the collection of data which permits their interpretation of the "most suitable programs" under varying environmental conditions that exist in the Nation. The State of Connecticut has stressed that towns evaluate to improve their local situation.

   Office of Education evaluation focuses on school wide data about children, school personnel, community, parents, and program descriptors. The State of Connecticut has emphasized evaluation of behavioral changes of youth served by the program in terms of the program objectives based on the needs of these youth.

Conflict occurs when local school personnel attempt to do such an extensive analysis that the primary purpose of the legislation is lost---that of improving the school performance of deprived youth. The additional reporting being asked of local communities has hampered the development of responsible evaluation of the Title I programs.

4. In some instances, successful Title I efforts during the first year lead school personnel to propose increased numbers of children for program services during the second year. Where this occurred, school personnel were directed to limit the number of children to be served to approximately the number of children upon which the Title I entitlement for their school district was based.

S E C T I O N T W O

ATTENDANCE, DROPOUT, STANDARDIZED TEST, AND CONTINUING EDUCATION DATA

I. TITLE I SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND MEMBERSHIP RATES

The average daily attendance and the average daily membership for public Title I schools in Connecticut have been provided in Table 1. These statistics were reported by local school district personnel in evaluation summaries submitted at the close of the 1966-67 school year. Page 7 of the evaluation format (Attachment A of this report) provided a chart to be completed for the reporting of these data.

Attendance data from 60 town evaluation reports form the data for Table 1. This table indicates that the percentage of attendance of Title I school youth was numerically less than that for all Connecticut public school youth for Fiscal Year 1967. No analysis has been made to determine whether the attendance rate difference was significant.

A limitation regarding the classification of a school as Title I or non-Title I should be considered in interpreting the data of Table 1. A school was counted as a Title I project school even if only a few youth from the school received the services of a Title I program. Therefore, Title I and non-Title I schools do not essentially differ in many cases.

TABLE 1

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL PUBLIC SCHOOLS* IN THE STATE, F.Y. 1967

Grade	Title I Public Schools		All Public Schools	
	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM
12	6162	6863		
11	6826	7621		
10	7674	8599		
9	9934	11009		
8	9405	10491		
7	9989	10759		
6	9406	10015		
5	8967	9524		
4	10791	11554		
3	10976	11817		
2	11188	12034		
1	11223	13401		
Pre K & Kind.	10093	11369		
Total of Pre K - 12	122,634	136,056	550,249	591,736
Percentage of Attendance	90.1%		92.9%	
Total Public School Enrollment	140,264 (est.)		610,037 (est.)	

*Average daily attendance and average daily membership for all Connecticut public school youth for grades preschool - 12 are the only statisticsavailable as a comparison for Title I school attendance and membership data.

II. DROPOUT RATE OF CONNECTICUT TITLE I SCHOOLS

The dropout rate for youth in grades 7 through 12 of Title I project schools compared to non-Title I schools has been provided in Table 2. These statistics were reported by local school district personnel in evaluation summaries submitted at the close of the 1966-67 school year. Page 8 of the evaluation format (Attachment A of this report) provided a chart to be completed for the reporting of these data.

Dropout statistics from 50 town evaluation reports form the data for Table 2. This table indicates that the dropout rate of students in Title I schools exceed the dropout rate of youth in non-Title I schools in grade 9 only. Dropout rates for grades 7,8,10,11, and 12 seem similar in Title I schools and non-Title I schools. No analysis has been made to determine whether the dropout rate differences found were significant.

The following limitations should be considered in making interpretations from the data of Table 2:

1. There were no high schools or junior high schools in which direct activities or services of Title I programs served one-third or more of the total school enrollment.

2. A school was counted as a Title I project school even if only a few youth from the school received the services of a Title I program. Therefore, Title I and non-Title I schools do not essentially differ in many cases.

3. The dropout data given for only a single year lack meaningful comparative data. Dropout data for previous years could not be provided for Connecticut schools due to changes in statewide pupil accounting procedures. The dropout withdrawal statistics provided for school year 1966-67 are the first Connecticut withdrawal statistics that have been collected which have distinctly separated dropout withdrawals from transfer withdrawals, thus making possible a clear dropout rate analysis.

Table 2

DROPOUT RATE* FOR CONNECTICUT TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED TO NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS, FISCAL YEAR 1967

Grade	Title I Schools	Non-Title I Schools
12	.0344	.0320
11	.0588	.0536
10	.0493	.0467
9	.0608	.0296
8	.0121	.0057
7	.0048	.0022
No. of Schools	106	99
Total No. of Students	51,590	47,384
No. of Dropouts	1,772	1,351

*Dropout rate was based on definitions from Pupil Accounting for Local and State School Systems, Handbook V, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and was computed as follows:

$$\text{Annual Dropout Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of Dropouts July 1 to June 30}}{\text{End of Year Membership (June 30)+Graduates+Dropouts (July 1 - June 30)}}$$

III. STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS

Standardized test results of children were reported by local school personnel in summary evaluations of Title I programs. Local school personnel selected tests for a variety of purposes and administered tests at the most appropriate time for each individual program. As a result, a compilation of the reported results has many variables with which to contend. Some tests were measures of intelligence while others were measures of achievement. Some reports were for single administrations of a test during the 1966-67 school year. Other reports were for pre and post testing, sometimes over the length of the school year and other times for a short period of time during summer months.

The way in which test results were reported differed also. Some reports gave average raw score gains for a group of Title I children; some gave gain scores in terms of percentiles; others gave a range of scores; and still others gave average raw score gains converted into grade equivalent scores. In some instances individual results were provided for each child in the program.

Other descriptive information about the standardized test results reported indicate that in a majority of cases, local school personnel compared the test score gains of Title I program children with expected gains based on Norm tables. Norm table data are obtained from an administration of the test to a standard unselected sample of American school children. In some instances, test score gains of Title I children were compared with test score gains obtained by administering the test to a comparison population within the town. In a few instances, test performance

gains of Title I children were compared with test performance gains of the same children for preceding years.

In an effort to provide a composite picture of Title I program results as can be ascertained from standardized tests, two types of standardized achievement test performance have been analyzed. These two skill performance areas were selected because an overwhelming majority of all test results reported for Title I children fell in these two categories. Table 3 shown on pages 23d-23t gives a tabulation of all standardized achievement test scores reported for Title I children in these two areas which met the following criteria:

1. Pre and post standardized test results were reported.
2. Name, form, subtest, and dates of administration of tests were identified.
3. Number and grade level of each Title I child contributing to post test over the pre test gain were clearly identified.
4. Test score gains reported were interpreted in terms of comparative data such as national norms.

The test results reported in Table 3 are based on 30 different standardized tests in the areas of language arts and arithmetic. Two hundred and twenty subtest average gain scores for given grade levels have been reported. Test data have been given for approximately 2300 children of 47 Title I programs carried out in 41 Connecticut local school systems.

An index was established to determine the relative successfulness of the 220 separate reportings of language arts and arithmetic achievement test results. The index was simply a tabulation of the number of

test score gains reported for Title I children which equaled or exceeded expected test gains based on Norm table data. The rationale for establishing this index is that the students selected for Title I programs based on disadvantagement criteria would not be expected to achieve test score gains commensurate to that of a standard unselected sample of American school children.

Findings based on the data reported in Table 3 indicate:

1. Language arts test score gains of Title I children equaled or exceeded test score gains expected of a standard unselected sample of American School children 121 out of a total of 171 reportings of standardized achievement subtest results (71% of the time).
2. Arithmetic test score gains of Title I children equaled or exceeded test score gains expected of a standard unselected sample of American school children 37 out of a total of 49 reportings of standardized achievement subtest results (76% of the time).

The conclusion based on these findings is that Connecticut school children receiving the benefits of Title I programs have demonstrated remarkable achievement in the areas of language arts and arithmetic as can be discerned from standardized test data.

TABLE 3

TITLE I STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS 1966-67

PRESCHOOL TEST RESULTS

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument · Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
A-8-4	14	school year	PEABODY PICTURE VOCABULARY	103	109	rw. sc.	6		
D-?-1	51	"	ABC INVENTORY	5.0	5.9		0.9	0.4	
C-20-?	125	6 weeks	PRESCHOOL READINESS: School Skills Total	23	30	rw. sc.	7		
D-?3-5	56	school year	PEABODY PICTURE VOCABULARY	63	77	"			
D-23-5		"	PEABODY PICTURE VOCABULARY	104	103	"			

GRADE 1 TEST RESULTS

D-?6-1	1?	6 weeks	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT · Comprehension	1.5	1.5	gr. eq.	0.0	0.1	
D-?6-1	14	"	GATES-MacGINITIE VOCABULARY	1.6	1.7	"	0.1	0.1	+
C-?0-?	19	school year	GATES PRIMARY READING TEST	1.9	2.3	"	0.4	1.0	
C-5?-1	4	"	GRAY ORAL READING	0.0	0.8	"	0.8	0.3	+
C-52-1	4	"	GATES AND NELSON SILENT READING	0.4	1.5	"	1.1	0.3	+
C-5?-1	6	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST · Reasoning	1.4	1.8	"	0.4	0.3	+
C-5?-1	6	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST · Fundamentals	1.0	2.2	"	1.2	0.3	+

23d

GRADE 2 TEST RESULTS

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
D-44-3	18	school year	GATES-MacGINITIE	1.7	2.6	gr. eq.	0.9	0.8	+
D-44-4	20	"	GATES-MacGINITIE	1.4	2.5	"	1.1	0.8	+
C-10-1	15	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	-	-	"	0.7	1.0	
D-19-6	17	6 months	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	1.5	2.3	"	0.8	0.4	+
C-52-1	14	school year	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST: Reasoning	1.8	2.4	"	0.6	0.3	+
C-52-1	14	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST: Fundamentals	1.0	2.2	"	1.2	0.3	+
C-28-1	12	"	GATES PRIMARY READING	-	-	"	0.3	1.0	
C-52-1	18	"	GRAY ORAL READING	0.6	1.1	"	0.5	0.3	+
C-52-1	18	"	GATES & NELSON SILENT READING	1.5	2.4	"	0.9	0.3	+
C-25-3	30	6 weeks	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	-	-	"	0.1	0.2	
C-25-3	30	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Math	-	-	"	0.1	0.2	
C-25-3	30	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: English	-	-	"	0.6	0.2	+
C-25-2	17	6 months	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	-	-	"	0.9	0.6	+
C-20-2	32	school year	GATES ADVANCED PRIMARY READING	2.5	3.6	"	1.1	1.0	+
D-36-1	13	6 weeks	GATES-MacGINITIE VOCABULARY	3.6	3.6	"	0.0	0.1	
D-36-1	13	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Comprehension	3.3	3.4	"	0.1	0.1	+

GRADE 3 TEST RESULTS

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument	Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
D-36-1	17	6 weeks	GATES-MacGINITIE	VOCABULARY	3.1	3.2	gr. eq.	0.1	0.1	+
D-36-1	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Comprehension	2.7	2.6	"	-0.1	0.1	
C-25-3	18	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Reading	-	-	"	0.1	0.2	
C-25-3	18	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Math	-	-	"	0.3	0.2	+
C-25-3	18	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	English	-	-	"	0.0	0.2	
C-25-2	16	6 months	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT:	Reading	-	-	"	0.9	0.6	+
C-28-1	7	school year	GATES ADVANCED PRIMARY READING		-	-	"	1.0	1.0	+
C-52-1	11	"	GRAY ORAL READING		1.3	1.8	"	0.5	0.3	+
C-52-1	11	"	GATES AND NELSON SILENT READING		1.3	1.8	"	0.5	0.3	+
C-52-1	8	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST:	Reasoning	2.7	3.2	"	0.5	0.3	+
C-52-1	8	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST:	Fundamentals	2.5	3.7	"	1.2	0.3	+
D-19-6	21	6 months	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Reading	2.3	3.3	"	1.0	0.4	+
C-10-1	14	school year	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT:	Reading	-	-	"	0.9	1.0	
D-44-3	22	"	GATES-MacGINITIE	.,	2.5	3.7	"	1.2	0.8	+
D-44-4	30	"	GATES-MacGINITIE	.	2.3	3.1	"	0.8	0.8	+
B-1-5	7	"	GATES-MacGINITIE		-	-	"	0.8	1.0	

GRADE 4 TEST RESULTS

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument	Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
B-1-5	4	school year	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Reading	-	-	gr. eq.	0.4	1.0	
B-1-5	4	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Language	-	-	"	0.4	1.0	
D-44-3	15	"	GATES-MacGINITIE		3.7	4.2	"	0.5	0.8	
D-44-4	22	"	GATES-MacGINITIE		3.0	3.8	"	0.8	0.8	+
A-3-7	16	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Paragraph Meaning	3.2	4.5	"	1.3	0.8	+
A-3-7	16	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Word Meaning	3.3	4.6	"	1.3	0.8	+
A-3-7	16	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Study Skills	2.6	3.4	"	0.8	0.8	+
C-36-2	8	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Paragraph Meaning	-	-	"	1.5	1.0	+
C-36-2	8	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Language Skill	-	-	"	1.9	1.0	+
C-10-1	10	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Reading	-	-	"	0.7	1.0	
E-19-1	5	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS	Vocabulary	47	53	rw. sc.		1.0	
C-36-2	8	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Word Meaning	-	-	gr. eq.	1.6	1.0	+
C-52-1	10	"	GATES & NELSON SILENT READING		3.1	3.8	"	0.7	0.3	+
C-28-1	14	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS	Reading	-	-	"	0.5	1.0	

GRADE 4 TEST RESULTS (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument	Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
C-52-1	10	"	GRAY ORAL READING		2.4	3.0	gr. eq.	0.6	0.3	+
D-12-3	4	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS:	Vocabulary	3.5	5.2	"	1.7	1.0	+
D-12-3	4	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS:	Paragraph Meaning	2.5	3.6	"	1.1	1.0	+
C-25-3	16	6 weeks	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Reading	-	-	"	0.0	0.2	
C-25-3	16	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	English	-	-	"	0.0	0.2	
C-25-3	16	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Math	-	-	"	1 0	0.2	+
C-52-1	5	school year	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST:	Fundamentals	4.0	4.4	"	0.4	0.3	+
C-52-1	5	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST:	Reasoning	3.4	4.7	"	1.3	0.3	+
B-1-5	4	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Arithmetic	-	-	gr. eq.	-0.1	1.0	+
D-15-8	11	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS:	Vocabulary	-	-	"	1.8	1.0	+
D-15-8	11	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS:	Comprehension	-	-	"	1.7	1.0	+
D-36-1	12	6 weeks	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT	Vocabulary	4.1	4.4	"	0.3	0.1	+
D-36-1	12	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT:	Comprehension	3.8	4.1	"	0.3	0.1	+
D-27-1	9	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS:	Vocabulary	4.7	5.0	"	0.3	0.2	+
D-27-1	0	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS:	Reading	4.6	4.8	"	0.2	0.2	+

GRADE 5 TEST RESULTS

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
D-36-1	17	6 weeks	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Vocabulary	4.4	4.4	gr. eq.	0.0	0.1	
D-36-1	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT Comprehension	4.4	4.2	"	-0.2	0.1	
D-15-8	13	school year	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Vocabulary	-	-	"	2.7	1.0	+
D-15-8	13	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Comprehension	-	-	"	1.6	1.0	+
D-12-3	5	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Vocabulary	2.5	3.2	"	0.7	1.0	
D-12-3	5	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	1.7	5.1	"	3.4	1.0	+
C-28-1	4	"	GATES READING SURVEY	-	-	"	1.0	1.0	+
C-52-1	5	"	GRAY ORAL READING	3.2	4.1	"	0.9	0.3	+
C-52-1	5	"	GATES AND NELSON SILENT READING	3.3	4.8	"	1.5	0.3	+
C-36-2	10	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Word Meaning	-	-	"	1.6	1.0	+
C-36-2	10	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	-	-	"	1.5	1.0	+
C-36-2	10	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Language Skills	-	-	"	1.3	1.0	+
C-10-1	10	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	-	-	"	0.8	1.0	
A-3-7	12	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	3.9	4.8	"	0.9	0.8	+
A-3-7	12	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Word Meaning	4.2	4.9	"	0.7	0.8	
D-44-3	10	"	GATES-MacGINITIE	3.7	4.8	"	1.1	0.8	+

GRADE 5 TEST RESULTS (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
D-44-4	23	school year	GATES-MacGINITIE	3.7	4.9	gr. eq.	1.2	0.8	+
C-59-2	15	"	GATES READING	4.5	5.3	"	0.8	0.8	+
B-1-5	6	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	-	-	"	1.0	1.0	+
B-1-5	6	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Language	-	-	"	0.8	1.0	
B-1-5	6	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic	-	-	"	0.9	1.0	

GRADE 6 TEST RESULTS

B-1-5	12	school year	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	-	-	gr. eq.	1.1	1.0	+
B-1-5	12	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Language	-	-	"	1.2	1.0	+
A-3-7	9	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	4.5	5.5	"	1.0	0.8	+
A-3-7	9	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Word Meaning	4.4	5.8	"	1.4	0.8	+
D-44-3	12	"	GATES-MacGINITIE	4.8	6.0	"	1.2	0.8	+
D-44-4	23	"	GATES-MacGINITIE	5.0	6.2	"	1.2	0.8	+
B-1-5	12	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic	-	-	"	0.9	1.0	
C-36-2	14	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	-	-	"	1.9	1.0	+
C-36-2	14	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT. Language Skills	-	-	"	1.8	1.0	+

GRADE 6 TEST RESULTS (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
E-19-1	6	school year	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Vocabulary	54	61	rw. sc.		1.0	
E-19-1	8	"	GATES & NELSON SILENT READING	4.8	5.5	gr. eq.	0.7	0.3	+
C-52-1	6	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST: Reasoning	5.8	6.4	"	0.6	0.3	+
C-52-1	10	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST: Fundamentals	5.7	6.6	"	0.9	0.3	+
C-28-1	10	"	GATES READING SURVEY	-	-	"	1.8	1.0	+
C-52-1	8	"	GRAY ORAL READING	4.4	6.2	"	1.8	0.3	+
D-12-3	4	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Vocabulary	2.2	3.9	"	1.7	1.0	+
D-12-3	4	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	2.4	3.1	"	0.7	1.0	
D-36-1	6	6 weeks	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Comprehension	4.7	5.2	"	0.5	0.1	+
D-15-8	14	school year	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Vocabulary	-	-	"	1.2	1.0	+
D-15-8	14	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Comprehension	-	-	"	2.0	1.0	+
D-36-1	6	6 weeks	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Vocabulary	5.2	5.7	"	0.5	0.1	+
C-36-2	16	school year	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Application	-	-	"	2.4	1.0	+
C-36-2	16	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Concepts	-	-	"	1.4	1.0	+
C-36-2	16	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Computation	-	-	"	2.0	1.0	+

TEST RESULTS FOR COMBINED ELEMENTARY GRADES

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
C-66-3	75	6 weeks	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Reading	-	-	gr. eq.	2.4	1.5	+
D-32-1	38	school year	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Reading	-	-	"	1.0	1.0	+
D-31-2	77	"	GATES-MacGINITIE VOCABULARY	3.4	4.0	"	0.6	0.8	
C-20-2	19	6 weeks	SHELDON BASIC READING TESTS: Rhyming Words	16	51	percentile			+
C-20-2	19	"	SHELDON BASIC READING TESTS: Initial Consonants	60	79	"			+
C-20-2	19	"	SHELDON BASIC READING TESTS: Word Forms	60	62	"			
C-20-2	19	"	SHELDON BASIC READING TESTS: Comprehension	12	93	"			+
C-20-2	19	"	SHELDON BASIC READING TESTS: Total Score	27	85	"			+
C-20-2	91	school year	GATES BASIC READING	4.6	5.9	gr. eq.	1.3	1.0	+
C-15-3	137	6 weeks	GRAY ORAL READING	2.0	2.3	"	0.3	0.2	+
C-64-3	30	school year	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Word Meaning	2.8	3.8	"	1.0	1.0	+
C-64-3	30	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	2.6	3.6	"	1.0	1.0	+
A-10-2	280	"	GATES READING	-	-	"	0.6	0.7	
D-20-2	22	6 weeks	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT: Word Knowledge	-	-	"	0.2	0.2	+
D-20-2	22	"	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	-	-	"	0.2	0.2	+
D-39-1	56	school year	GILMORE ORAL READING: Word Accuracy	3.4	4.7	"	1.3	0.9	+

231

TEST RESULTS FOR COMBINED ELEMENTARY GRADES (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
D-39-1	56	school year	GILMORE ORAL READING: Comprehension	2.7	4.8	gr. eq.	2.1	0.9	+
D-3-1	41	"	DURRELL-SULLIVAN READING ACHIEVEMENT	3.2	4.2	"	1.0	0.8	+
D-3-1	18	"	DURRELL-SULLIVAN READING ACHIEVEMENT	3.6	4.6	"	1.0	0.8	+
C-25-2	29	4 months	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Computation	-	-	"	0.5	0.4	+
C-25-2	29	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Concepts	-	-	"	0.6	0.4	+
D-26-2	48	school year	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS: Reading	-	-	"	0.6	1.0	
D-19-6	16	6 weeks	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	4.1	4.6	"	0.5	0.2	+
C-36-2	17	school year	WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Reading	-	-	"	0.8	1.0	
C-36-2	17	"	WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Spelling	-	-	"	1.0	1.0	+
C-36-2	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Word Meaning	-	-	"	0.7	1.0	
C-36-2	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	-	-	"	0.7	1.0	
C-36-2	17	"	GRAY ORAL READING	-	-	"	1.3	1.0	+
D-33-1	15	"	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT: Word Discrimination	-	-	"	0.9	1.0	
D-33-1	15	"	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	-	-	"	0.7	1.0	
D-33-1	14	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Vocabulary	-	-	"	1.2	2.0	
D-33-1	14	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Reading	-	-	"	1.4	2.0	

TEST RESULTS FOR COMBINED ELEMENTARY GRADES (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
D-8-2	47	school year	GATES READING SURVEY	3.9	5.2	gr. eq.	1.3	1.0	+
D-17-3	6	6 weeks	GATES PRIMARY READING: PWR	-	-	"	0.9	0.4	+
D-17-3	5	"	GATES PRIMARY READING: PSR	-	-	"	0.8	0.4	+
D-17-3	4	"	GATES PRIMARY READING: AWR	-	-	"	1.2	0.2	+
D-17-3	5	"	GATES PRIMARY READING: APR	-	-	"	1.1	0.3	+
A-5-2	18	school year	BOND DEVELOPMENTAL READING	2.5	4.0	"	1.5	0.8	+
A-5-2	12	"	BOND DEVELOPMENTAL READING	3.7	4.5	"	0.8	0.8	+
A-5-2	15	"	BOND DEVELOPMENTAL READING	3.4	3.9	"	0.5	0.8	
C-36-2	17	"	WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Arithmetic	-	-	"	1.1	1.0	+
C-36-2	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic	-	-	"	0.9	1.0	
A-5-2	12	"	GATES READING COMPREHENSION	-	-	"	1.2	0.8	+
C-4-1	26	"	CALIFORNIA READING	-	-	"	0.5	0.5	+
D-43-2	133	6 weeks	STONE-DURRELL VOCABULARY	-	-	"	0.3	0.1	+
E-36-3	7	school year	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Reading	-	-	"	1.4	1.0	+
E-36-1	22	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Reading	-	-	"	0.9	1.0	
E-36-1	22	"	CALIFORNIA SURVEY OF READING	-	-	"	0.8	0.8	+

TEST RESULTS FOR COMBINED ELEMENTARY GRADES (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
C-59-2	13	school year	GATES READING TEST: Vocabulary	4.5	5.7	gr. eq.	1.2	0.9	+
C-59-2	13	"	GATES READING TEST: Comprehension	4.3	5.8	"	1.5	0.9	+
C-60-1	33	"	AMERICAN SCHOOL READING BATTERY	1.9	2.7	"	0.8	0.9	
D-5-3	21	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Reading Component	3.1	4.3	"	1.2	1.0	+
E-25-1	23	"	CTB DIAGNOSTIC READING SCALES: Word Recognition	3.3	3.9	"	0.6	0.9	
E-36-1	22	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Math	-	-	"	0.7	1.0	
E-36-1	22	"	CALIFORNIA SURVEY OF MATH	-	-	"	0.9	0.8	+

GRADE 7 TEST RESULTS

C-47-5	18	3 months	WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Reading	-	-	gr. eq.	1.3	0.3	+
C-47-5	18	"	WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Spelling	-	-	"	0.5	0.3	+
D-36-1	6	6 weeks	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Comprehension	4.7	5.2	"	0.5	0.1	+
D-15-8	13	school year	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Vocabulary	-	-	"	2.6	1.0	+
D-15-8	13	"	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Comprehension	-	-	"	1.3	1.0	+
D-12-3	20	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	5.4	7.2	"	1.8	1.0	+

GRADE 7 TEST RESULTS

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Scrore	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
D-27-1	7	6 weeks	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	1.7	1.8	gr. eq.	0.1	0.2	
D-27-1	9	"	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT: Reading	1.9	1.7	"	-0.2	0.2	
D-27-1	7	"	IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS: Reading	2.9	3.1	"	0.2	0.2	+
E-28-1	7	school year	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT: Vocabulary	4.9	6.1	"	1.2	1.0	+
E-28-1	7	"	METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT: Comprehension	4.6	6.0	"	1.4	1.0	+
C-52-1	14	"	GRAY ORAL READING	6.4	8.5	"	2.1	0.3	+
C-52-1	14	"	GATES AND NELSON SILENT READING	6.4	7.2	"	0.8	0.3	+
D-17-3	5	6 weeks	GATES SURVEY	-	-	"	2.3	0.3	+
A-3-7	16	school year	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	5.6	6.1	"	0.5	0.6	
D-48-8	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	6.5	7.5	"	1.0	0.7	+
C-36-2	19	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Component	-	-	"	1.2	1.0	
C-36-2	19	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Component	-	-	"	1.5	1.0	
C-36-2	19	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Application	-	-	"	0.8	1.0	
C-36-2	26	"	SRA COLORADO BASIC SKILLS ARITHMETIC TEST	31% overall improvement					
C-47-5	18	3 months	WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Arithmetic	-	-	gr. eq.	0.7	0.3	+

GRADE 7 TEST RESULTS (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
C-52-1	11	school year	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST: Reasoning	6.3	7.8	gr. eq.	1.5	0.3	+
C-52-1	11	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST: Fundamentals	6.1	7.6	"	1.5	0.3	+
E-36-2	7	"	CALIFORNIA SURVEY OF MATHEMATICS	-	-	"	0.9	0.8	+
D-48-8	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Spelling	6.3	6.8	"	0.5	0.7	
D-48-8	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Language	6.9	7.8	"	0.9	0.7	+
D-48-8	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Social Studies	7.1	8.1	"	1.0	0.7	+
D-48-8	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Science	6.4	7.5	"	1.1	0.7	+
D-48-8	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Component	5.4	6.4	"	1.0	0.7	+
D-48-8	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Concepts	6.6	7.8	"	1.2	0.7	+
D-48-8	17	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Application	6.2	7.9	"	1.7	0.7	+

GRADE 8 TEST RESULTS

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
C-66-2	4	school year	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Reading	5.9	7.4	gr. eq.	1.5	1.0	+
C-47-5	11	3 months	WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Reading	-	-	"	1.2	0.3	+
C-47-5	11	"	WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Spelling	-	-	"	0.5	0.3	+

GRADE 8 TEST RESULTS (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
D-12-3	4	3 months	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Reading	38	67	percentile			+
C-52-1	3	school year	GATES AND NELSON SILENT READING	5.6	6.6	"	1.0	0.3	+
A-3-7	14	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	6.7	7.8	"	1.0	0.6	+
E-36-2	7	"	CALIFORNIA SURVEY OF READING	-	-	"	0.9	0.8	+
C-36-2	12	school year	SRA COLORADO BASIC SKILLS ARITHMETIC TEST	28	percent	improvement			
C-36-2	8	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Computation	-	-	gr. eq.	1.2	1.0	+
C-36-2	8	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Concepts	-	-	"	1.3	1.0	+
C-36-2	8	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Application	-	-	"	2.4	1.0	+
C-47-5	11	3 months	WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST: Arithmetic	-	-	"	0.3	0.3	+
C-66-3	75	6 weeks	IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: Math	-	-	"	1.3	1.5	
D-48-8	14	school year	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Paragraph Meaning	7.3	8.9	"	1.6	2.0	
D-48-8	14	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Spelling	6.2	6.8	"	0.6	2.0	
D-48-8	14	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Language	6.9	8.4	"	1.5	2.0	
D-48-8	14	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Social Studies	6.8	9.6	"	2.8	2.0	+
D-48-8	14	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Science	6.6	9.7	"	3.1	2.0	+
D-48-8	14	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Computation	5.5	7.6	"	2.1	2.0	+

GRADE 8 TEST RESULTS (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
D-48-8	14	school year	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Concept	6.8	9.2	gr. eq.	2.4	2.0	+
D-48-8	14	"	STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: Arithmetic Application	7.1	9.2	"	2.1	2.0	+

TEST RESULTS FOR COMBINED JUNIOR HIGH GRADES

C-66-2	13	school year	TEST OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS: Reading	37	39	stand. sc.	2	2	+
C-52-1	4	"	GATES AND NELSON SILENT READING	6.7	7.7	gr. eq.	1.0	0.3	+
C-47-5	13	3 months	CALIFORNIA STUDY METHODS SURVEY: Attitude	26	26	rw. sc.			
C-47-5	13	"	CALIFORNIA STUDY METHODS SURVEY: Mechanics	35	37	"			
C-47-5	13	"	CALIFORNIA STUDY METHODS SURVEY: Planning	14	16	"			
D-19-4	38	school year	SRA: Word Recognition	17	34	percentile			
D-19-4	38	"	SRA: Word Comprehension	4	7	"			
D-19-4	38	"	SRA: Vocabulary	1	3	"			
D-19-4	38	"	SRA: Reading Comprehension	20	31	"			
D-19-4	38	"	SRA: Word/Minute	171	200	rate			
C-52-1	4	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST: Fundamentals	7.7	9.2	gr. eq.	1.5	0.3	+
C-52-1	4	"	CALIFORNIA ARITHMETIC TEST: Reasoning	8.4	9.2	"	0.8	0.3	+

TEST RESULTS FOR COMBINED JUNIOR HIGH GRADES (Continued)

Town Symbol	No. of Youth	Length of Intervention	Test Instrument: Subtest	Pre	Post	Type Score	Gain	Expected Gain	Interp.
A-11-11	41	6 weeks	GATES-MacGINITIE TEST: Reading	-	-	gr. eq.	0.3	0.2	
A-5-2	65	school year	SRA :Reading	6.2	6.5	"	0.3	0.8	
A-5-2	65	"	SRA: Langua; e	6.2	6.9	"	0.7	0.8	
A-5-2	137	"	NELSON READ..	5.8	6.7	"	0.9	0.8	+
A-5-2	15	"	SRA: Language	5.6	6.1	"	0.5	0.8	
A-5-2	57	"	NELSON READING	6.8	8.2	"	1.4	0.8	
A-5-2	22	"	GATES READING COMPREHENSION	-	-	"	0.8	0.5	+
A-5-2	12	"	GATES READING COMPREHENSION: Beginning	-	-	"	1.8	0.8	+
A-5-2	6	"	GATES READING COMPREHENSION: Advanced	-	-	"	1.1	1.5	
C-60-1	32	"	AMERICAN SCHOOL READING BATTERY	-	-	"	1.5	0.9	+
C-1-2	33	"	SRA: Arithmetic Reasoning	-	-	"	1.4	1.0	+
C-1-2	33	"	SRA: Arithmetic Concepts	-	-	"	1.1	1.0	+
C-1-2	33	"	SRA: Arithmetic Computation	-	-	"	1.1	1.0	+

IV. GRADUATES CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL

The number of graduates from Title I project high schools continuing education beyond high school in: (1) high school post-graduate work, (2) junior college, (3) college or university, (4) vocational, technical, or commercial institute, or (5) nursing school as was determined at the completion of the 1966-67 school year has been provided in Table 4. These statistics were reported by local school district personnel in evaluation summaries submitted at the close of the 1966-67 school year. Page 9 of the evaluation format (Attachment A of this report) provided the questions to be answered for the reporting of these data.

Continuing education statistics from 28 town evaluation reports form the data for Table 4. Table 4 indicates that 49 percent of the graduates from Title I project high schools continue education beyond high school as compared to a statistic for all Connecticut public schools of 64 percent.

The following limitations should be considered in making interpretations from the data of Table 4:

1. There were no high schools in which direct activities or services of Title I programs served one-third or more of the total school enrollment.

2. A school was counted as a Title I project school even if only a few youth from the school received the services of a Title I program. Therefore, Title I and all other public high schools do not essentially differ in many cases.

TABLE 4

GRADUATES FROM TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH STATE NORM*

	Title I High Schools	All Public High Schools
Total Number of Graduates	7,099	30,632
Number of Schools	34	131
Mean Size of Graduating Class	209	234
Number of Graduates Continuing Education	3,440	19,599
Percentage of Graduates Continuing Education	49%	64%

*Statistics used for the state norm were obtained from Post High School Activities of 1966 Public High School Graduates obtained from the Bureau of Research, Statistics and Finance, Connecticut State Department of Education. This publication which was revised June 7, 1967 is the most current information available concerning Connecticut high school graduates continuing education beyond high school.

S E C T I O N T H R E E

EXEMPLARY TITLE I PROJECTS

I. TITLE I PROGRAMS

The projects described in this section of the report are representative of exemplary programs from the point of view of the Connecticut State Department of Education. Effectiveness of programs in improving the school performance of disadvantaged children was determined on the basis of one or more of the following criteria:

1. Objective and/or subjective data that strongly indicate the improvement of youth in school performance as indicated in F.Y. 1967 Title I summary evaluation reports submitted by local school district personnel.

2. Recommendations of State Department of Education consultants who have visited programs and acted as liaison to the Title I programs in the towns.

3. Judgment of local school district superintendents as to the effectiveness of specific Title I programs in helping disadvantaged youth.

Hartford's Project Concern transported 266 minority group children from essentially segregated schools to the schools in five suburban communities. The children participating in the project were randomly selected from schools in the North End of Hartford which

has a non-white population of approximately 85 percent. Project children attended K-5 classrooms in thirty-three different suburban schools. Their school performance was checked against that of a control group attending classes in Hartford's schools in the North End.

After one year of operation, youngsters in the project who were placed in suburban schools and received supportive assistance from extra teachers and indigenous aides from the North End were found to have clearly outperformed: (1) children who were bussed to suburban communities without supportive assistance, (2) children remaining in the North End schools with supportive assistance, and (3) children remaining in the North End schools without supportive assistance. The differences found were statistically significant and were found across the full range of grades. The evaluation instruments used for the interim report (a two year experiment) were primarily devoted to the analysis of cognitive functioning and school skills.

In addition, it was found that youngsters transported to suburban schools tend to persist in their school placement, attend regularly, and take part in extra-curricular activities. There were no signs among experimental subjects of increased anxiety, of higher incidence or emotional or behavioral problems, or of greater school failure.

Suburban teachers reported that bussed youngsters fit in well, adjusted quickly, and responded positively to high academic expectations. There were no signs that suburban teachers experienced unique difficulties in the educational stimulation or classroom management of inner city youngsters.

Finally, inner city parents were receptive to the concept of suburban education, and responded to inclusion in the program by increased participation in school activities.

Ledyard's Learning Center provided instruction in language arts and reading to 78 elementary grade children during the school day. One teacher with counseling, psychological examiner, and social work background and another teacher of reading staffed the project. A rotating schedule was developed to overcome the problem of children missing the same classroom activity in Learning Center visitations.

Four major achievements have come about over the two year period the project has been in operation: (1) a well equipped Center has sustained the interest of youngsters in individually developing their reading and language arts skills; (2) children verbalized more willingly in the Center and also in their classrooms as a result of small group discussions taking place about spontaneous

topics important to youth as a regular part of Center activity; (3) contact between the home and teacher of the program maintained through a series of home visits, telephone calls, and written communications has provided important points of reference for working with these children; and (4) the school staff have been kept informed through regular conferences and written reports and actively contributing in their evaluatory roles.

Standardized and informal reading tests have been used on a before and after basis and have given evidence of children's increased reading skill. In addition, narrative evaluations submitted by classroom teachers have indicated children's sustained interest in the program throughout the year, greater self-confidence, and a willingness to participate more readily in the school program.

Norwalk's program of English as a Second Language served children representing 21 nationalities. The first phase of the project brought teachers together during summer months to learn the techniques and methods of teaching English as a second language. In addition, a curriculum was constructed consistent with the language arts and social studies programs of the town.

During Fiscal Year 1967, 324 children of kindergarten age to grade 12 youth were served daily at an Orientation Center. The Center was staffed by eight classroom teachers, a teacher's aide, a parent-school coordinator, an illustrator, and a director. A twenty station language laboratory with facilities for listening and recording were available as well as other audio-visual aids for small group and individual instruction.

The staff of the Center devised a test to screen and classify the learning skill proficiency of children. Instructional sessions emphasized an oral approach. When a teacher was sure that the child had mastered a segment of work by hearing and speaking, the child was encouraged to read and then write what he had learned to understand and say.

About twenty-five percent of the students in the Orientation Center Program were able to return to the full time program in the home school after the first year of operation. Tests of listening comprehension, speaking proficiency, and reading skill were administered to children at the beginning of the year and again at the close of the school year. Results of the test scores have shown substantial gains interpreted for children in the areas of listening, speaking, and reading.

Norwich's preschool program operated in five centers of the town and served 116 children during Fiscal Year 1967. The goals were to help children grow in the use of oral language as well as to help them increase their ability to understand language concepts at increasingly higher levels.

The centers provided a curriculum which included the following areas: oral language development, discussion periods, free play activities, stories, poems and songs, dramatization of everyday events and stories, physical development activities, creative work, and trips into the community.

Evidence of progress was reported based on Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test scores administered at the beginning and at the close of the school year program.

Southington's Title I program has used teacher aides to help children in kindergarten through grade three classes improve in basic skill subjects and to improve communications between persons in the school and in the home. An orientation program for teacher aides preceded their assignments to help teachers in the classrooms. Professional staff from the State University worked with educators in the town in providing the orientation sessions.

A total of 165 elementary children received the services of Southington's aide program which also provided selected children in the kindergarten and primary grades with individualized instruction to improve language arts skills. Diagnosis of language arts skills deficiencies were determined by the work of a psychological examiner who also aided in evaluating personality traits and intellectual skills of selected children.

A written summary evaluation of the year-long program showed improvement in reading, oral expression, good retention of spelling, and good progress in written expression. Visitation by a State Department consultant indicated that both teachers and building principals were most enthusiastic in terms of the effectiveness of this project in improving the ability of the teacher to meet individual needs of disadvantaged youth. In addition, the consultant reported the teacher aides had obviously been well trained in that they were working in the classroom setting with efficiency and confidence in the tasks assigned to them. Furthermore, over the two year period of the project the consultant felt that teacher-aides and the youngsters had become involved in a warm and comfortable relationship which encouraged the youngsters to work effectively and efficiently.

II. TITLE I AMENDMENT PROGRAMS

Effective programs for children served by amendments to Title I, PL 89-10 have been described in the three publications listed below. Two copies of each of these publications have been forwarded with this report.

1. Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1967 of Educational Programs Conducted in Connecticut by State Aided or Supported Schools for Handicapped Children Under The Provisions of PL 89-313. Connecticut State Department of Education, October 1967.

2. Evaluation Report of Educational Programs Conducted in Connecticut by State and Local Agencies for Neglected and Delinquent Children Under the Provisions of PL 89-750. Connecticut State Department of Education, October 1967.

3. Educational Program for Children of Migratory Agricultural Workers Under the Provisions of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Connecticut State Department of Education, November 1967.

S E C T I O N F O U R

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF CONNECTICUT TITLE I PROJECT EVALUATIONS

The Title I ESEA projects identified below are a representative sample of Connecticut's Fiscal Year 1967 program evaluations as required in Instructions for State Annual Evaluation Report Title I, ESEA, Fiscal Year 1967.

The representative sample was determined by alphabetically listing (and grouping by SMSA) all projects of all participating towns and identifying every sixth project for the sample. In addition, project evaluations have been included for four SMSA towns which were not identified using the sampling method indicated. This was done to fulfill the requirement that every SMSA A town be among the evaluations sent forth.

Three shipments (2 copies each) of a total of 51 different project evaluations identified by the sampling technique were forwarded to the Office of Education on November 8, November 28, and December 5, 1967.

The town identification and project numbers of the representative sample of Title I projects were as follows:

Eleven SMSA A Towns

1. Bridgeport 15-23, 15-29, 15-35
2. Groton 59-4
3. Hartford 64-8, 64-27
4. Meriden 80-5
5. New Britain 89-2
6. New Haven 93-3, 93-11, 93-21, 93-28
7. New London 95-3
8. Norwalk 103-9, 103-15, 103-7
9. Norwich 104-4
10. Stamford 135-2
11. Waterbury 151-7

Greenwich 57-1
Beacon Falls 6-1
Branford 14-3
Coventry 32-1
Ellington 48-2
Farmington 52-1
Lisbon 73-3
Monroe 85-2
Newington 94-1
Plainville 110-8
Shelton 126-3

Southington 131-1
Stonington 137-1
Stratford 138-6
Vernon 146-4
West Haven 156-1
Windsor 164-3
Brooklyn 19-2
Colchester 28-1
Derby 37-3
East Hampton 42-8
Killingly 69-5

New Hartford 92-2
Old Saybrook 106-1
Plymouth 111-1
Stafford 134-1
Torrington 143-2, 143-3
Windham 163-8, 163-9
Bozrah 13-2
Lebanon 71-2
Sterling 136-3
Region #1 1R-1

ATTACHMENT A

Format for Summary Evaluation of Title I Programs for Fiscal Year 1967

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Division of Instructional Services
Office of Program Development

January, 1967

To: Superintendents of Schools, and Project Directors and Evaluators of ESEA Title I and P.A. 523 educational programs.

Re: Annual Summary Evaluation of ESEA Title I and P.A. 523 educational programs for fiscal year 1967.

The evaluation report form for evaluating Title I programs for the second year is being sent at this early date to give the towns sufficient time for planning summary evaluation reports.

The State Department of Education has made every effort to request only vital information. You will find that the specific project information required has been reduced in this year's report form. However, a section on town-wide data (dropout, attendance figures, etc...) has taken the place of Part III, general information collected for the previous year.

It is hoped that you will contact the major consultant of the State Department of Education assigned to work with your community and secure his assistance in the development of your evaluation plans.

SUMMARY EVALUATION OF P.A. 523 AND TITLE I, P.L. 89-10 PROGRAMS

FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Project Director_____ Date Evaluation was submitted_____

Project Evaluator_____ Source of Project Funds:
( ) Title I, P.L. 89-10
( ) P.A. 523
( ) Jointly funded Title I and P.A. 523

I COMPREHENSIVE DATA (Submit data for this section directly on this form)

1. Project Number_____ Town or cooperating towns_____

2. Give an unduplicated count (eliminate double counting) of public school children and youth served by the approved project. _____

3. If a Title I project is being reported, give an unduplicated count of non-public school children and youth served by the approved project._____

4. What were the approximate hours per week of services provided for each child or youth participating in the project? _____

5. What was the duration in weeks of project activities for youth?_____

6. Give the actual number of all children (include non-public school children if any) by grade level benefiting directly from project services.

Pre-school	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Other

7. If a Title I project or a component of a Title I project is being reported, list below the attendance areas in your school district that have been identified for project services.

8. List below the criteria used to select children for services of the project being reported.

9. If a Title I program is being reported, state the specific services and activities that were implemented for non-public school children residing in the attendance areas designated for project services.

10.

a. List the number of children and youth directly served by the project who were promoted to the next grade level for the school year of 1967-68. _____

b. List the number of children and youth directly served by the project who were not promoted to the next grade level for the school year 1967-68. _____

11. For all students served by P.A. 523 programs, provide the following:

a. Give the aggregate days of attendance of children and youth directly served by the project. (Consult the ANNUAL SUMMARY, Number of Days in Attendance in the Connecticut School Register). _____

b. Give the aggregate days of membership of children and youth directly served by the project. (Consult the ANNUAL SUMMARY, Number of Days in Membership in the Connecticut School Register). _____

c. List the number of grade 7-12 youth served by the project who withdrew from school upon reaching their 16th birthday during school year 1966-67. _____

d. List the number of grade 7-12 youth served by the project who continued in school upon reaching their 16th birthday during the 1966-67 school year. _____

12. Evaluation of Objectives: Use the following chart form in restating and evaluating the objectives directly related to changes expected of children and youth receiving project services. (Reference: the second edition of Evaluating Programs Approved Under Title I of Public Law 89-10, Connecticut State Department of Education)

As important as other objectives might be that have been set by the town, report only the effect of project services on the children selected for the project.

Give the evaluator's INTERPRETATION of the FINDINGS for each objective as shown in the example given in the reference above.

If additional pages are used in reporting objective evaluation, continue the use of 8½x11 paper in "chart form" as arranged on this first page.

Restatement of OBJECTIVES	Expected LEARNING OUTCOMES	Major project ACTIVITIES and/or services implemented in an effort to achieve the objective	EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENT or technique designated to measure growth toward the objective, including: when used, with whom, by whom constructed, and other pertinent data	State the FINDINGS from the data given

13. Describe the <u>most</u> successful activities or components of the project.

14. List any problems that were encountered in implementing and/or operating the project.

15. How did the town overcome the problem of staffing the project? (How did the town get staff or what arrangement made a staff possible for the project?)

January, 1967

PART II SUMMARY ANNUAL REPORTING OF TOWN SCHOOLS STATISTICS
(FOR ESEA TITLE I EVALUATIONS)

Information about attendance, dropout data, and continuing education is needed by the U.S. Office of Education to give some indication of the effect of Title I efforts throughout the country.

All towns implementing Title I programs during the school year 1966-67 must provide data for every section (A through D) that follows. Eventhough a town's Title I emphasis might not include older age youth, the sections concerning dropout data and continuing education must be collected.

The State Department of Education is forwarding this requirement early so that town staff will have as much time as possible to set up for the collection. This evaluation will be forwarded along with your annual summary reporting of Title I projects at the close of the 1966-67 school year.

Please note that single form compilations are needed eventhough you may have many schools involved in Title I programs.

Town Name_____

Title I Non-Public School Participation, 1966-67
(Submit data for all Title I schools on the single form provided)

TABLE I

NUMBER OF PROJECTS AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN
PARTICIPATING BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT

	On Public school grounds only		On Non-Public school grounds only		On both Public and Non-Public school grounds		On other than Public or Non-Public school grounds	
	Proj. #	*No. of Children	Proj. #	*No. of Children	Proj. #	*No. of Children	Proj. #	*No. of Children
Regular school day								
Before school day								
After school								
Weekend								
Summer								

If combinations of the above were used, list below and give the number of children involved.

*This figure is not expected to be an unduplicative count of children.

Town Name_____

AGGREGATE DAYS OF ATTENDANCE AND AGGREGATE DAYS OF MEMBERSHIP FOR PUBLIC TITLE I SCHOOLS
(All youth)

1966-67 TITLE I SCHOOLS ONLY			(For State agency use only)	
Grade	Aggregate Days of Attendance	Aggregate Days of Membership		
12th Grade				
11th Grade				
10th Grade				
9th Grade				
8th Grade				
7th Grade				
6th Grade				
5th Grade				
4th Grade				
3rd Grade				
2nd Grade				
1st Grade				
Pre K & Kind.				

For schools with Title I programs, refer to the Connecticut School Registers at the close of the school year.

To get aggregate days of attendance and aggregate days of membership, refer to the MONTHLY SUMMARIES section near the end. Collect information from each register for every grade level and record the total for the town Title I schools in the table provided on this page.

Town Name_____

C. DROPOUT DATA IN YOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS AND NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

Refer to the MONTHLY SUMMARIES of the Connecticut School Registers at the close of the school year.

Collect information from each register for every grade level and record the total for the town separately for Title I schools and Non-Title I schools in the table provided on this page.

Title I Schools

Grade	Total dropouts from July 1, 1966 to June 30, 1967 (D1, D6, D11, D17)	End of year Membership (June 30, 1967)	Graduates (Total of C1)	(Do not use this space)
12				
11				
10				
9				
8				
7				

No. of schools _____

Non-Title I Schools

Grade	Total dropouts from July 1, 1966 to June 30, 1967 (D1, D6, D11, D17)	End of year Membership (June 30, 1967)	Graduates (Total of C1)	(Do not use this space)
12				
11				
10				
9				
8				
7				

No. of schools _____

Town Name_____

D. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL

Number of Title I project high schools _____

Total of the June 1967 graduates from Title I project high schools _____

Percentage of June 1967 Title I project high school graduates continuing education beyond high school in: (1) high school post-graduate work; (2) junior college; (3) college or university; (4) vocational, technical, or commercial institute; or (5) nursing school as can be determined at the completion of the school year, June 1967.

(Check once below for each Title I project high school)

0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-99%